UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/812,839	03/30/2004	Lalit M. Bharadwaj	U 015121-7	3629
140 LADAS & PAF	7590 02/22/200 RRY LLP	EXAMINER		
26 WEST 61ST		LIN, JERRY		
NEW YORK, N	NT 10023		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1631	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/22/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/812,839	BHARADWAJ ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
JERRY LIN	1631		

	JERRY LIN	1631	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>28 January 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	R ALLOWANCE.	
<ol> <li>The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:</li> </ol>	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, wwith 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	g date of the final rejection	n.
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	f). on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 tension and the corresponding amount of the corresponding amount of the corresponding than three months after the mailing dat	36(a) and the appropriat of the fee. The appropriationally set in the final Office	e extension fee ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
NOTICE OF APPEAL			
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w</li> </ol>	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
AMENDMENTS			
<ol> <li>The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, the proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, the proposed amendment(s).</li> <li>They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below).</li> </ol>	nsideration and/or search (see NO		cause
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or	•	ducing or simplifying t	ne issues for
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a control NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.	
<ol> <li>The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12</li> <li>Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):</li> </ol>		mpliant Amendment (	PTOL-324).
<ol> <li>Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):</li> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>	<del></del>	timely filed amendmer	nt canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  Claim(s) allowed:  Claim(s) objected to:  Claim(s) rejected: 1.2.4.5.11.13.17 and 22-32.  Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 19.		l be entered and an e	xplanation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fail	s to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.
<ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered bu <u>See note.</u></li> </ol>	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
<ul><li>12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s).</li><li>13. ☐ Other:</li></ul>	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
	/Marjorie A. Moran/ SPE, AU 1631 2/18/08		

Continuation of Notes 7 and 11:

Rejection made under 35 U.S.C §112 2nd Paragraph.

Applicants have amended claims 1 and 22 to clarify that storage DNA consists of a mixture of homogenous/heterogeneous DNA. This rejection is withdrawn.

Rejection made under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatenable over Bancroft et al. in view of Ackley.

The Applicants first state that Bancroft et al. does not teach the encrytion of the the standard 256 ASCII characters. The Examiner agrees, but maintains that is it obvious to do so in view of Ackley.

The Applicants also state that the Bancroft et al. method cannot represent digital documents like images/ audio/ video, etc. However digital documents are not a limitation in the claims and cannot be used to distinguish the instant claims from the prior art.

The Applicants state that Ackley does not teach using the four unique bases to represent the 256 ASCII characters. The Examiner agrees, however, the Examiner relies on the combination of Bancroft et al. and Ackley to make obvious using the 4 unique DNA bases to represent 256 ASCII character. In this case, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See In re Keller, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); In re Merck & Co., 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

The Applicants state that Ackley does not provide a motivation to use a character set comprising DNA bases. However, KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc. forecloses the argument that a specific teaching, suggestion, or motivation is required to support a finding of obviousness. See the recent Board decision Ex parte Smith (Bd. Pat. App. & Interf. June 25, 2007). In the instant case, the claims would have been obvious because the technique for improving the codes to include more characters was part of the ordinary capabilities of a person of ordinary skill in the art, in view of the teaching of the technique for improvement in other situations. Both Ackley and Bancroft et al. teach ways to improve the method of encoding messages. Ackley teaches a well known method of increasing the amount of data a code may encode by increasing the length of the code (columns 1 and 2). Thus, it would have been predictable to one of ordinary skill in the art that increasing the length of the code by Bancroft et al. would also increase the capacity of Bancroft et al.'s code to encode more characters. One of ordinary skill in the art would reasonably expect that adding one more base codes to Bancroft et al.'s method would allow one to encode the entire 256 ASCII character set.

Applicants particularly point out claim 22 and state that Bancroft et al. do not teach that a plurality of molecules each encoding different portions of the same message. The Examiner disagrees. Bancroft et al. teach (column 6, lines 30-42) that a plurality of messages may be encoded in the plurality of DNA molecules. However, all of these messages may be intended for the same recipient (column 3, lines 19-33). Thus each molecule encodes a different portion of the same message. Bancroft et al. do teach the instant claims.

## **Contact Information**

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JERRY LIN whose telephone number is (571)272-2561. The examiner can normally be reached on 10:00-6:30, M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Marjorie A. Moran can be reached on (571) 272-0720. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/JL/